REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the FINAL office action of Examienr Gerald J. O'Connor, mailed 09/22/2003.

Claims 1-3 and 14-23 are in the case, none being allowed.

Objection under 35 U.S.C. 132

The Examiner objects to the introduction into the claims of material including "interface with an external ledger system" and "opening" the interface, characterizing such as new matter not supported by the original disclosure.

Applicants believe that support in the specification exists for the concepts being claimed, and calls to the attention of the Examiner Figures 16 and 17, and the descriptive material at pages 41-44. The "interface" to which applicants refer is represented by line 305 and the "opening" is supported by the transmit function of step 316 and the accept function of step 320. The "external ledger

system" to which applicants refer is supplier source data 310 which has been reformatted as flat file 314, and is referred to as a "chart of accounts 140 with descriptions" of an enterprise (supplier) system 300 at page 30, lines 3-9. That this system is "external" is not new matter, for it is outside of firewall 380.

Applicants have amended the claims to use the specific language from the specification which describes this matter previously added to the claims.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claim 1-3 and 14-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Gardner et al. (US 5,758,327).

Applicants traverse.

In the rejection, for example, of claim 1, the Examiner states that Column 5, line 57 through Column 6, line 13 is equivalent to applicants statement that an administrator associates valid account codes from the global chart of accounts to specific commodity codes. In fact, Gardner is

here referring to activities performed by the REQUESTER and not by the ADMINISTRATOR. Applicants claims specifically address the actions that an administrator takes to make the buying experience easier for the requester.

Further, the Examiner states that Column 6 lines 64-67 is equivalent to applicants claim that the administrator pushes a subset of the account codes to a specific commodity in a specific company. Applicants believe that a more clear term to express this distinction is "associate" and have amended the claims accordingly. (See specification, at page 30, line 22 for support for this use of the term.)

The teaching of Gardner to which the Examiner refers relates to attachments to a requisition that a user has created. Garner is describing keeping attachments associated with a requisition as it travels through the approval process. On the other hand, applicants invention relates to the buyer (administrator) subsetting (by selecting) a general ledger system's chart of accounts into subsets (of selected accounts) that are usable and meaningful for the requester before they (the requesters) ever start the requisition process. This is brought out in all of the claims by language such as "administrator

selecting from said requisition catalog system database

valid accounts with descriptions for a given commodity and

purchase period for said given company."

Applicants urge that claims 1-3 and 14-23 be allowed.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 1-3 and 14-23.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conversation with applicant(s) attorney could possibly facilitate prosecution of the case, he may be reached at the number noted below.

Sincerely,

Jean-Paul Chollon, et al.

By

Shelley M Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 21 Nov 2003

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Attorney at Law
314 Main Street
Owego, NY 13827

Phone: (607) 687-9913
Fax: (607) 687-7848